

Colorado/Lavaca BBEST Meeting, February 15, 2011, Draft Agenda
Rm 433, Shapiro Building, LCRA Austin, 8:30 am until 2:30 pm (or until completed)

Approve consensus points/action items from Dec. 2010 meeting
Review consensus points/action items from Jan. 2011 meeting
~~Review and address format questions and draft formats~~

Complete review of the report and address questions

Environmental Flow Fact sheets

Section 1

Section 2

Section 7

Section 3 – including discussion on geomorphology

Section 4

- Abbreviations: List at the front and then just use the abbreviations throughout the document or have list and spell out on first reference within each chapter or in entire document.
- Fact sheets: what title(s) do you want at the beginning and throughout that material? Thom asked for Section Heading before each set of bullets. Yes or no?
- “sound environment” or “sound ecological environmental
- Label all graphs in the Detailed Summaries or not?
- The graphs, such as in the water quality section of the Detailed Summaries, as well in other sections, do you want them to stay the size they are?
- We will try to keep all tables to one page. To do that, some might have to be 9 point. Is that okay? Do you want us to change the page orientation to landscape on the ones that are more horizontal?
- Once we put it in InDesign, the only way you all will be able to edit it is by commenting in a pdf. Do you think everyone will need to see it one more time in Word?
- Do you think there are sections that are pretty final? So we could start working on these sections in InDesign? What about references? Do you think we could go ahead and get those formatted correctly or do you think there will be a lot of additions? Once they put their sections back into the BBEST Full Draft Edits, should we assume they are ready?
- References end of each Section, ex. Section 1, 2 3, etc.; at the end of each subsection, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.1. etc.; or have them at the end of the complete document but divided by Section Headers.
- “Colorado-Lavaca” or “Colorado-Lavaca-Navidad”. I made that suggestion based on the fact that for regulatory purposes, TCEQ includes the Navidad River in Basin 16 and calls that basin the Lavaca Basin. We have fairly consistently used the “Colorado-Lavaca/Navidad basins” or some version incorporating all 3 names as Thom suggests. The TCEQ web page refers to us as the Colorado and Lavaca Rivers and Matagorda and Lavaca Bays Basin and Bay Stakeholder Committee and Expert Science Team. Does anyone have an opinion?
- Refer to as the “BBEST” throughout the report rather than the “Colorado-Lavaca or Colorado-Lavaca-Navidad BBEST” or the “BBEST team” in the report
- “Historical Hydrology” section in the detailed summaries. As Thom points out, there is inconsistency in the information in these sections and some detailed summaries do not have “Historical Hydrology” sections. This information has been obtained by the literature available for each of the sites and unfortunately some sites have more information than others. I suggest we leave these in despite the inconsistencies to indicate to the SAC and the stakeholders that we have made a reasonable effort to obtain as much relevant information as possible. The SAC criticized previous BBESTs for not adequately searching available sources of information. I’m open to suggestions.
- Bottom line: “Environmental Flow Regime” rather than “Environmental Flow Recommendation”
- Asiatic clam or Asian clam

- In water quality summaries: Change “none measured” to “not measured”
- Instream Flow Analyses section:
 - 3.1 Geographic Scope
 - 3.2 Seasons
 - 3.3 Flow Regime Components
 - 3.4 Hydrographic Separation
 - 3.5 Period of Record
 - 3.6 HEFR Applications
 - 3.7 Fish, Habitat, and Flow Relationships
 - 3.8 Riparian Vegetation
 - 3.9 Water Quality
 - 3.10 Geomorphology
- Appendices: Water Quality, Texas Blend Modeling, TWDB freshwater inflows for Matagorda-Lavaca and East Matagorda, ?????

Geomorphology narrative statement in final flow regime:

“A quantity of flow in addition to flows provided by subsistence, base, pulse and overbank flows proposed here would be needed to maintain channel morphology and sound environment.” (consensus of BBEST at January meeting)

“Channel maintenance flows should ensure that approximately 85 percent of the annual flow volume and that the daily, monthly and annual regime characteristics for the Period of Record are simultaneously maintained. This number can be refined during the adaptive management process.” (proposed revision)